

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

PATRICIA HARRINGTON, individually
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

AIRBNB, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:17-cv-558-YY

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge Youlee Yim You issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on July 21, 2017. ECF 23. Judge You recommended that Plaintiff's Motion to Remand (ECF 12) and associated request for attorney's fees be denied. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States. v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review de novo magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge You’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Judge You’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF 23. Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand to State Court (ECF 12) and associated request for attorney fees are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 7th day of August, 2017.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge